



## EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday 26 November 2013

### MINUTES

*Present:*

Professor Mike Ewing (*Chair*)

Mr David Ashton	Mr Keir Gallagher
Ms Karen Barnard	Ms Judith Hillmore
Professor David Bogle	Dr Arne Hofmann
Professor Chris Carey	Dr John Mitchell
Mr Jason Clarke	Ms Kathleen Nicholls
Mr Mike Cope ( <i>vice: Dr Fiona Strawbridge</i> )	Dr Hilary Richards
Dr Brenda Cross	Ms Olga Thomas
Dr Caroline Essex	Professor Derek Tocher
Dr Julie Evans	Mr Ben Towse
Mr Marco Federighi	Dr Paul Walker
Dr Dilly Fung	Dr Andrew Wills

*In attendance:* Ms Clare Goudy; Ms Sandra Hinton (Secretary); Ms Irenie Morley; Professor Anthony Smith; Dr Hazel Smith.

*Apologies for absence were received from:* Ms Valerie Hogg; Mr Zubair Idris; Ms Cecilie Jorgensen; Dr Helen Matthews; Ms Paula Speller; Dr Fiona Strawbridge; Ms Susan Ware.

#### *Key to abbreviations*

AC	Academic Committee
AISG	Administrative Information Services Group
CALT	Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching
CMIS	Content Management Interoperability Services
CRMPA	Master of Public Administration

NYU	New York University
PIQ	Programme Institution Questionnaire
PMASG	Programme and Module Approval Steering Group
RDC	Research Degrees Committee
SIFSWG	Student Information System Funding Working Group
SIPB	Student Information Programme Board
SoP	School of Pharmacy
UCLBE	UCL Board of Examiners
UCLU	UCL Union
UKBA	UK Border Agency

**15 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 4 OCTOBER 2013**

**Confirmed:**

- 15.1 The Minutes of the meeting of EdCom held on 4 October 2013 [*EdCom Mins. 1-14, 04.10.13*], circulated previously.

**Reported:**

- 15.2 The EdCom Chair welcomed the following new members to EdCom:

Dr Dilly Fung, Director of the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching;  
Mr Dan Cofas, Postgraduate Student nominated by the UCLU [**in absentia**];  
Ms Cecilie Jorgensen, Undergraduate Student nominated by the UCLU [**in absentia**].

**16 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** [*see also Mins. 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 & 26 below*]

**16A School of Pharmacy: request for derogations** [*EdCom Min. 8, 13-14*]

**Received:**

- 16A.1 An oral report from the Director of Student Administration.

**Reported:**

- 16A.2 At its 4 October meeting, EdCom had received a very late request from the SoP for derogations in respect of degree weightings and capped resits. EdCom had resolved:

that any weightings which had already been notified to students who commenced their studies in 2013-14 should be permitted to stand, but that

**16B Examination re-sit fees** [EdCom Min. 10B.3, 13-14]

**Noted:**

- 16B.1 The UCLU Education and Campaigns and Postgraduate Students' Officers had confirmed that they would not now be submitting a paper to the 26 November EdCom meeting, but that they hoped to submit a paper to the Committee in the New Year.

**RESOLVED:**



- 19.3 EdCom was being invited to consider a number of proposals for credit-bearing short courses and to invite the CPD and Short Course Development Team to develop these proposals on behalf of EdCom with a view to implementation during the 2014-15 academic session.

***Discussion:***

- 19.4 The following points were noted:

that the perceived difficulties around the approval of modules were actually issues with enrolment times and not problems with getting modules registered;  
that integration of CPD within the overall Portico framework would raise issues, including defining the boundaries of what a short course actually was;  
that issues in respect of distance learning and blended learning would need discussion and there would need to be appropriate recognition of the requirements of the UK Visa and Immigration Service (formerly the UKBA);  
that Student and Registry Services was not appropriately resourced to take responsibility for a proliferation of credit-bearing short courses; particularly in view of the fact that, among other things, they would need to be incorporated in all statutory returns made to the Higher Education Statistics Agency;  
that students could already take stand-alone credit-bearing modules but that

**Discussion:**

20.3 The UCLU Education and Campaigns Officer made the following points:

that the draft had been put together without any consultation with the UCLU Welfare Officer or the Disability Officer;  
that there was a lack of compulsory contact with the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing (the policy advocated no meeting between the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing and the student to discuss the issues);  
that there was a lack of guidance in the draft policy as to what the recommendation to the Faculty Tutor should be;  
that UCL should focus more attention on supporting students in such a way as to prevent the development or onset of severe health problems.

20.4 In response, a number of Faculty Tutors noted that the policy was intended to support cases which were both extreme and very rare. It was emphasised that the extent to which rational and systematic interaction was possible with such students could vary considerably. It was resolved that the UCLU Officers should set out in writing to the Director of Student Administration all the UCLU's issues with the draft policy.

20.5 The Faculty Tutor of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Social and Historical Sciences noted that the draft policy stipulated (at para 7) that where adjustments were not possible or if a student had been unable to continue with his/her studies even with reasonable adjustments in place, having consulted health care specialists, the Director of Student Support and Wellbeing would recommend to the student's Faculty Tutor that the student's registration should cease either permanently or for a specified period of time. However, it was important to realise that a Faculty Tutor currently lacked the power under Statute 11, (Regulations for Management 14.1 and 14.2) to suspend or terminate a student's studies on health grounds and could do this only under delegated authority of the Provost where there was evidence of academic insufficiency. EdCom resolved that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Registrar, as Secretary to UCL Council.

20.6 Noting the points above, EdCom broadly welcomed the policy and resolved that a further iteration should be submitted to its meeting of 6 March.

**RESOLVED:**

20.7 That the UCLU Officers should set down in writing any issues with the draft policy and email this to the Director of Student Administration. **[Action: Mr Keir Gallagher and Mr Ben Towse]**

20.8 That the need for further discussion regarding Regulations for Management 14.1 and 14.2 should be brought to the attention of the Registrar, as Secretary to UCL Council. **[Action: Mr David Ashton]**

20.9 That the draft policy be revised taking into consideration the points noted above and a further iteration submitted to EdCom's meeting of 6 March 2104. **[Action: Mr David Ashton, Ms Sandra Hinton to note]**

**21 FACULTY ISSUES WITH PORTICO FUNCTIONALITY**

- 22.7 The Director of ISD<sup>1</sup> who had attended the meeting *vice*: Dr Fiona Strawbridge, commented as follows:

that he was keen to see improved Portico services which better met the needs of the University but to achieve this it would be necessary to identify and address the underlying root causes. The reports focused on funding issues which, addressed alone were unlikely to improve the situation significantly;

that spend on SI projects had increased in recent years and continued to increase (he estimated this at a 60% increase this year);

that annual SITS upgrade and start of session projects were not competing for funding as these were mandatory activities. Bid documents were required to ensure that the activities were correctly resourced in the project portfolio and not in order that they might then compete for funding;

that the SIPB did, in fact, have the power to re-allocate funding between the domain groups and there was therefore no need for a separate domain group or for a ring fenced pot of money;

that allocating of funding between the four domain groups, in his view, worked well and would perhaps work even more effectively if there was increased academic representation on the AISG (it was suggested that this might comprise members of EdCom).

***Discussion:***

- 22.8 Members of SIPB noted that they had not previously been aware that it was possible to vire monies between budgets and domain groups.
- 22.9 Although student information system funding bids had in 2013 been submitted to a different ISGC domain group (the LTISG) and had been more successful, the success of these bids, attributed in part to the greater academic membership of this group, may actually have been that they had involved issues of greater interest to academic members. This could not be taken for granted in future years and was therefore not a sound basis on which to proceed.
- 22.10 EdCom strongly endorsed the Working Group's recommendation that there be a ring-fenced budget for operational Portico work.

***RESOLVED:***

- 22.11 That EdCom endorse the Working Group's recommendations, as set out at paragraph 36 of its report.
- 22.12 That the above minute of EdCom's comments on the report accompany its submission to the Vice-Provost (Education), for subsequent further discussion by the ISGC. ***[Action: Ms Sandra Hinton]***

---

<sup>1</sup> On 3 December, the Director of ISD then sent an email to the EdCom Chair and Mr Tim Perry, Registrar/Chair of the SISFWG, which set out his views in more detail. This will be considered under Matters Arising at EdCom's 6 March meeting.



**23 PROCEEDINGS OF FACULTY TEACHING COMMITTEES: SESSION 2012-13**

***Received:***

- 23.1 At EDCOM 2/15 (13-14) the report, introduced by the EdCom Chair, Professor Mike Ewing.

***Reported:***

- 23.2 The Committee was invited to note the report and consider whether any action was needed to follow up the common matters of concern raised and whether any significant issues should be brought to the attention of AC.

***Discussion:***

- 23.3 The Faculty Tutors of the Faculties of Life Sciences and Brain Sciences noted that some of the items set out at Annex A to the report (where notable matters considered by individual FTCs are recorded) were inaccurate and that, consequent





27.2 At EDCOM 2/18.1 (13-14) the revised procedure for information.

**RESOLVED:**

27.3 That any EdCom members with issues to raise concerning the revised procedure, which was being submitted to EdCom for information prior to its submission to Academic Board and then Council, should send these to the Deputy Registrar, copying in the EdCom Chair and Secretary. **[Action: EdCom members to note]**

**28 APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAMMES OF STUDY**

**Noted:**

28.1 The PMASG Chair, acting on behalf of EdCom and on the recommendation of PMASG, had approved the following programmes of study since the meeting of EdCom on 4 October 2013:

*Master of Engineering and Public Policy*  
*Master of Science and Public Policy*  
*MSc Transport, Health and Policy*  
*MA Library Information Studies (Qatar-based programme)*  
*MSc Transport, Health and Policy*

**30B UCL Board of Examiners**

***Noted:***

30B.1 At EDCOM 2/20 (13-14)